DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 474 FL 013 850

AUTHOR Erazmus, Edward T.
TITLE Teaching the Phonology via Articulatory Settings.
PUB DATE May 83
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (35th, Cincinnati, OH, May 24-27, 1983).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Speech); *English (Second Language); Phonology; Polish; *Pronunciation Instruction; Second Language Instruction

ABSTRACT

The failure of the phonological approach in establishing native-like speech in the learner is examined in connection with new knowledge derived from articulatory setting theory. This theory is based on the work of Honikman (1964) who demonstrated that there is an intimate relationship between the tongue and teeth in speech production. Specifically, the tongue is fixed at a specific point to a given area on the teeth and this fixing is called anchorage. Anchorage differs from language to language, conforming to the principles of uniqueness of phonemic systems. The anchorage of English sets the tongue for speech operations completely in the upper hemisphere of the mouth. Contrasting English anchorage to Polish anchorage, it can be seen that Polish anchorage is produced by the tongue tip fixing on the base of the lower front teeth or incisors. In order to learn native-like speech, the learner must have knowledge of the target anchorage, practice the target anchorage, and then maintain it. Although finding and setting the anchorage are relatively easy, it is crucial to find and practice strategies that will maintain the anchorage in connected speech. Use of this approach depends upon teacher awareness. Every teacher must consciously work on being a pronunciation teacher. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edward T. Erazmus

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED232474

FL 013850

TEACHING THE PHONOLOGY VIA ARTICULATORY SETTINGS[1]

Edward T. Erazmus

University of Kansas

Pronunciation teaching may be defined as the process of modifying a language learner's speech to approach that of a native speaker with the aid of phonological data from the target language. The heyday of pronunciation practice in ESL occurred in the 40's, 50's, and early sixties. Much of the impetus for this movement came from Charles Fries and his associates at the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan (Lado, Fries 1954). We will recall that Kenneth Pike, the eminent phonetician and phonemicist, played a role in the production of the English Pronunciation manual of ELI, which served as a model in the field for decades. Despite the prestige of the linguistic input that provided the early methodology, the teaching of pronunciation in ESL classes throughout the country went into a decline until today it is almost nonexistent, being replaced by a communicative/functional model of teaching. As we look back with hindsight, we must say, in all honesty, that the phonological approach to establishing native-like speech in the learner was a failure. The present-day approach that replaces it and that I characterize as "soft speak" also produces dubious results, but at least avoids the pitfall charged to the phonological approach by its opponents of boring the students to death while teaching them little.

To what do we attribute the failure of the phonological approach, which was certainly extensively tried? Is it a failure of the practitioner to skillfully apply the knowledge at his disposal or is it a failure of linguistic science to provide us with good data to do the job? Recent developments in phonology would seem to indicate that we were operating with an imperfect knowledge of the phonological system and, if not teaching erroneous matter, at least dealing with it counterproductively. In this paper I will attempt to indicate what phonological data have been lacking and how this condition can be remedied with the application of new knowledge derived from what, in this paper, will be called "articulatory setting theory."

The new data in phonology that I have reference to derive from a single article by Beatrice Honikman, "Articulatory Settings" (1964). If this article is not familiar to the reader, it is not surprising for, though it appears in a number of bibliographies and receives comment from

[1]Paper delivered at the NAFSA Annual Conference in Cincinnati, May, 1983.

a number of scholars, its essential message on tongue anchorage, which is at the heart of articulatory setting theory, has been uniformly overlooked or not understood by its readers (Wadsworth 1979, Wenk 1983). In fact, it appears as if I am the only researcher responding to Honikman's concept of anchorage at this time.

The major contribution of Honikman to phonetics on the global level is to point out the intimate relationship of tongue and teeth in the production of speech. She is the first scholar to note the phenomenon that she refers to as anchorage. She provides a description of the tongue anchorage of English and French but, unfortunately, fails to take the next step of generalizing from these cases and producing a definition of anchorage applicable to all languages. At any rate, the significance of anchorage seems to be lost in a plethora of data constituting her picture of articulatory settings, both internal and external.

As every beginning student of linguistics quickly learns, modern phonetics and phonology are premised on the theory of points of articulation converging with manners of articulation. This convergence provides us with a grid which, at the abstract level, can be applied to all languages and which, beginning with the second quarter of this century, proved an effective tool for the phonemic analysis of numerous languages. The ease of applicability of this principle for the phonetic accounting of speech sounds caused us to overlook the systematic relationship of tongue to teeth, which is to be found in the production of every sound of a language.

It was Honikman's observation that captured for the first time one of the most important features of human language, the tongue anchorage. Without the anchorage of the tongue somewhere on the circle of teeth surrounding the tongue, human language would be impossible. From linguistic evidence we conjecture that the tongue does not aimlessly flop around in the mouth in the production of the sounds of a language. Its control is established by fixing its rim or sides at a specific point to a given area on the teeth, which surround it at all times and set its limits of movement. This fixing is called anchorage, and the anchorage differs from language to language, conforming to the principle of uniqueness of phonemic systems, a doctrine universally held by linguists. The anchorage behavior is so natural and innate to us that we are unaware of its existence and, as we note, it has even escaped the attention of linguists (Erazmus 1982). The difficulty of transferring from one's native phonological system to another is recognized as the most formidable aspect of second-language learning. As we unravel knowledge of anchorage and how it works and bring it under conscious control, we tap a potential of greatly simplifying and expediting the learning of a second phonology, thus mitigating one of the greatest obstacles to the learning of second languages. With these preparatory remarks on anchorage we will proceed to a discussion of the anchorage of English and some methods of dealing with it in ESL pedagogy.

A workable definition of anchorage is that, in a given language, one specific area of the tongue is fixed to a specific tooth area. The tongue area is found on the circumference of the sides of the tongue which touch

the teeth. In anchorage description the teeth are identified by their common dental names and form a wall within which the tongue operates during language production. The tongue area in anchorage maintains rigid contact with the specified tooth area during the entire speech act and, hence, the name "anchorage." The exact dimensions of these areas can be specified with a fair amount of certainty and accuracy by intuitive observation of our tongue movements. The tongue, which is the most mobile organ in the body, relates to the teeth, which are the hardest and most ridged substance in the body. The teeth, which are thirty-two in number, exist in two planes corresponding to each other and form a very accurate measurement tool for describing the activity of the tongue, with which they are in constant contact during speech. The tongue, for its part, is extremely sensitive and can register in our spatial and sensory perceptions fairly accurate data as to its relationship to the teeth. By making records and observations of the sensory data, we are able to provide a map of how to maneuver articulators to arrive at native or near-native performance of the phonology of a language. The uniform anchorage of the speakers of a given language indicates we have a specific target to work for and good possibilities of achieving success in mastering it in practice.

The anchorage of English, as described by Honikman and readily confirmed by native speakers, is that the back of the tongue normally opposite the upper molars attaches itself to the inner face of the upper molars, this attachment extending along the remaining molars to include the premolars, but terminating at the first premolar. The tip and forward blade do not anchor but form a moveable appendage to the attached portion. This moveable portion occludes for consonants on the alveolar ridge or hangs free under the ridge during the production of vowels. The most stable part of the anchorage is on the last molars, and we call this the fulcrum point of the English anchorage. The back of the tongue has the privilege of moving or sliding up and down the face of the last molar to make accommodations for vowel heights but does not make any forwarding or backing movements from this fulcrum position. Thus, in my view, there are no such things as back or front vowels in English. In summary, the essential features of English anchorage are the back of the tongue fixed laterally to the upper molars and the tip of the tongue forming its moveable part for the occlusion on the alveolar ridge of the upper front consonants. This description of the sides and tip of the tongue does not account for the mid portion of the tongue, which, for example, may rise in the back to acclude with the velum and soft palate to form the velars and, in other cases, to rise and fall to form concave and convex surfaces in the mouth cavity. These actions can operate independently of the anchorage.

The anchorage of English, in effect, sets the tongue for speech operations completely in the upper hemisphere of the mouth. Furthermore, this position in the upper hemisphere is maintained during all of our waking hours, in and out of speech, except when masticating, thus attesting to the formidable power of the anchorage and the great resistance it offers to the tongue in its adaptation to other anchorages. The tongue in its rest position (when not talking or chewing) may be referred to as holding a relaxed static anchorage or neutral position. When speech onset takes place from the relaxed static anchorage, the tongue assumes a tensing and pulls back and up in the mouth, pressing its sides on the back molars. The

pervasiveness of the anchorage position during and between speech accounts for our ignorance of its presence. It feels so "normal" we develop no awareness of it. In dealing with other language systems we simply use our native settings, causing the well-known foreign accent until the target system can be learned by steps of progressive approximation.

From what has been said about the natural condition of anchorage, it is obvious that an extraordinary effort of consciousness raising must be made to discover its existence. Two brief demonstrations of the essential action of English anchorage will be undertaken at this point. I might interject to say that the articulatory settings to be described here represent my own ideolect, which means there is a commonality with all English speakers but a difference in minutiae since no one's speech history or speech physiology is identical. For the first demonstration we will have a native speaker stand in front of a mirror and assume a position of speech onset for the word "ten" and subsequently open the jaws about 1 1/2 inches wide. On looking in the mirror, we will find the tongue attached to the upper hemisphere of the mouth by the back clinging to the inner sides of the back teeth and the tip pressing on the alveolar ridge. Actually what we mostly see is the tissue at the bottom of the tongue, the top being out of view. As we utter the word "ten," the tip of the tongue opens briefly, releasing the closure for /t/ and simultaneously making an opening for the vowel /ɛ/. The mid lax spread vowel /ɛ/ was chosen for the demonstration because we can open the jaws about 1 1/2 inches without causing too much distortion in the pronunciation of the word. The vowel is emitted briefly, and the tongue closes immediately for the occlusion of the nasal /n/. This action is clearly visible as we view the underside of the tongue.

As we have noted, in the production of "ten" only the tip and forward blade have moved for the vowel opening, the remainder of the tongue keeping rigid. In a nutshell this displays the anchorage of English. By utilizing some phonological play, we may extend the word "ten" to form "tent," then "tents" and "tentative" or even "tentatively" and observe the minimal action of the tip and the rigid hold of the anchorage, except for the phoneme /l/, which is a back lateral release, the only nonanchored phoneme in English. Through this sequence we gain insight into the great economy, simplicity and unity which the anchorage imposes on the language and we can conclude that similar unifying functions take place in the anchorages of all languages. In another exercise, let us run through the minimal pairs of "ten," namely, "teen" /i/, "tin" /I/, "ten" /ɛ/, "tan" /æ/, "ton" /ə/, "tune" /u/, "tone" /o/, "tawn(y)" /ɔ/, "tine" /aI/, "town" /aU/, and note some of the functional peramaters of the vowel system, such as, tongue height, tension/laxity, and lip speading/rounding. For want of space these cannot be elaborated here except to say that, with anchorage at work, it is an extremely simple and transparent system.

For a paper view of anchorage let us look at it as it operates across languages. I refer to the charts that appear in Table 1. In this display we obtain a working format for the discovery of anchorage in languages. The two languages involved are English and Polish with the expressions, "my sister/moja siostra," mutual translations of each other, analyzed. In this schematic we note that columns containing the features of the tongue, namely,

TABLE 1

ARTICULATORY SETTINGS OF ENGLISH/POLISH EXPRESSIONS

"my sister/moja siostra" (Right half of mouth description)

A. English

PHONEME	TIP	FORWARD BLADE	BACK BLADE	BACK	JAW/LIPS
/m/ +V bilabial nasal	suspended beneath alveolar ridge	side on face of first premolar	side on cutting edge & biting surface of pre-molar & molars	lower face of last molar	lips lightly closed; upper & lower teeth overlap
/a/ low, lightly tensed & rounded vowel	slight drop from above	slight move down	slight motion down	slight lowering on last molar	jaw drops slightly; lips part, slightly round
/y/ +V lip spread glide	slight rise from /a/	side rises to gum line of premolar	side rises to high gum line of molars, constricting alveolar gap	high on face of last molar and hard palate	teeth return to overlap; lips narrowly open & spread
/S/ -V alveolar sibilant	alveolar ridge forming slit opening	face and gum line of premolars	face of premolars, gum line & face of molars	face of last molar, little tension	teeth almost touching; lips narrow parted & sides spread
/I/ high, lax lip spread vowel	drops from alveolar ridge suspended	drops from gum line to face of 1st premolar	face and gum line of 2nd premolar & molars	rises slightly on face & gum of last molar	very slight jaw drop; lips spread slightly
/S/ -V alveolar sibilant	tip returns to alveolar ridge to form slit	returns to gum line of first premolar	same as above; slight rise	drops from slight rise on gum line	jaw closes a bit; lips spread but less than above
/t/ -V alveolar stop	tip closes on alveolar ridge	rises to gum line of 1st premolar	rises to gum line of premolars & molars	face and gum line of last molar	jaws close but not touching; lips tense open, slight protrusion
/r/ vocalic retroflex continuant	tip drawn back of alveolar ridge	gum line and face of 2nd premolar	curled over biting edge of first molars	face and gum of last molar with tension	teeth part 1/4 inch; lips round and protrude slightly

B. Polish

PHONEME	TIP	FORWARD BLADE	BACK BLADE	BACK	JAWS/LIPS
/m/ +V bilabial nasal	gum line of lower front teeth	inner face of lower front teeth	sides on cutting edge of upper canines	biting face of upper premolars & first molars	jaws open about 1/4 inch lips pursed inwardly
/ɔ/ mid rounded vowel	slight lowering on gum line	slight lowering on front teeth & canines	drops free from upper canines	releases from upper teeth	jaw opens to 1/2 inch; lips round gently
/y/ +V lip spread glide	rises, rests on upper half of lower front teeth	face of upper canines	sides rise to gum line of upper canines & premolars	rises to hard palate of molars	jaw closes, teeth overlap; lips spread
/a/ low central vowel	deep on gum line	drops to lower canines	releases from upper canines & premolars	drops to top of lower molars	jaw opens 1/4 inch; lips open slightly
/š/ -V palatal sibilant	lightly touching face of lower front teeth	sides on face of upper canines	alveolar ridge & sides of upper premolars	gum line & face of upper front molars	front teeth overlap; lips slightly open outward
/ɔ/ mid rounded vowel	pressing on lower front teeth gum line	drop to face of lower canines	cutting edge of lower premolars	drops to cutting edge of lower molars	jaw drops 1/4 inch; lips round, light tension
/s/ -V sibilant	touching upper face of lower front teeth	side between upper and lower canines	face of upper and lower premolars	face of upper & lower molars, fairly firm	jaws almost touching; lips lightly spread
/t/ -V dental stop	pressing firmly on face of lower front teeth	face of upper front teeth	gum line of upper front teeth, closing air	face of upper premolars & molars	same as above
/r/ +V dental tap	on upper part of lower front teeth	quick tap on gum line of upper teeth	taps alveolar ridge at center	face & gum line of upper molars	same as /st/
/a/ low central vowel	Same across columns as /a/ above, except slightly more jaw drop.				

tip, forward and back blade, and back of the tongue, in addition to a column for jaw and lip description. The left-hand column lists the phonemes being examined in the context of a word. Entered in the columns opposite the phonemes are the teeth areas in contact with the tongue for that phoneme. Because of space restrictions, only essential movements of the tongue and teeth surfaces are listed. In these descriptions we focus on the sentient sides of the tongue, for the most part, because the mid and central areas of the tongue seldom contact the teeth. The undersides of the tongue also fall outside the scope of the charts.

From the Polish data we deduce, by comparing the columns, that the anchorage is produced by the tongue tip fixing on the base of the lower front teeth or incisors. The tip does move up and down the incisors but does not leave these teeth, and this constitutes the anchorage, or what may be called home base. The blades and back of the tongue freely shift from upper to lower teeth as the phonemes demand. The blades form the occlusion on the inside surface of the upper teeth and gums for the frontal sibilants, stops, and affricates. Jaw and lip movement are prominent. Tongue activity is predominantly in the front part of the mouth. Palatalization, a prominent feature, is formed by the blades sliding forward across the upper canines and premolars as the jaw drops for vowel production.

A few remarks may be added to the prior discussion of the articulatory settings of English. In the chart note that the anchorage appears in the "back blade" and "back" columns, the face of the last molar being the most stable part of this configuration and, hence, termed the fulcrum. The "tip" column displays the active settings of the tongue with its play about the alveolar ridge. Note that the tongue anchorage for the /m/ in "my" anticipates the setting of the following vowel, as is true of other labials and velars. This is an indication that the vowel is the commanding element of the syllable.

From these demonstrations of anchorage we pass on to the pedagogical relevance of anchorage. It should be obvious that the sounds of language A cannot be produced natively with the settings of language B as the accents of innumerable second-language learners sadly demonstrate. But that is precisely what the language learner in his ignorance and intuitive reactions does, a situation that the teacher is unable to cope with for lack of knowledge of what is transpiring. The inner workings of the tongue have been completely overlooked by linguists and pedagogues. During the early days of modern phonetic development in the late 19th century our major phonologists suspected some kind of phonetic base at work in languages that provided their distinguishing characteristics and unity, but this base they were unable to define (Kelz, 1971). Possibly because they tended to approach the problem through acoustic rather than physiological clues, the dialogue ended in futility and except for a thin line of continuing scholarly interest the discussion of "phonetic base" was abandoned. Honikman, of course, revitalizes the whole issue with her profound analysis.

It is impossible to reconstruct, either practically or theoretically, an anchorage of a language from acoustic data or the heard sounds of a language. The source of the description must be a native speaker describing his speech physiology at work. The sounds across languages are too similar to provide adequate clues for the extremely fine physiological differences that exist. Without assistance and guidance, the language learner (or researcher) relates target sounds to his own native phonemes and settings. Our extensive efforts in ESL to teach phonology through methods of mimicry and pattern practice essentially failed and, as we noted, for all practical purposes have been abandoned. Success was sporadically achieved, but this was the exception rather than the rule. Drills on short segments, minimal pairs, isolated words, short expressions, single features, etc., tended to be counterproductive since we were ignorant of the physiology at work and as likely to accommodate the learner's native settings as to lead them on to the target settings. We haphazardly clubbed at the system hoping the right things would happen, and they mostly did not.

The question arises, then, does the knowledge of the technology of articulatory settings and specifically anchorage offer us any solutions on the pedagogical level? The answer is a qualified "yes" since the implementation of the theory is yet in its infancy stage. The following discussion will outline some avenues of approach I have worked with in the area.

The first principle we invoke in programming for articulatory settings (anchorage) is the obvious one that, if the learner is to speak like a native, he must assume the settings of the target language and this from the first moment of language learning. To realize our goals, we divide the learning process into three stages: (a) knowledge and approximation of the target anchorage, (b) practice of the target anchorage, and (c) maintenance of the target anchorage. We will deal with these in succession.

In English, as has been pointed out, the tongue operates entirely in the upper hemisphere of the mouth since anchorage effectively limits tongue activity to this region. Most languages examined for anchorage to date have a lower jaw anchorage. This means that for our learners we must raise the back of the tongue to the upper molars and maintain it in this position during speech. Static or nonspeech anchorage can be readily imitated and approximated. Simply raise the back of the tongue to the roof of the mouth and hold it there. This is the operation we performed earlier in the demonstration with the word "ten." Thus, the English anchorage can be fairly easily explained and demonstrated to adult learners although convincing them of its relevance and establishing its workability may be another question. Most of our learners come to us with an established "compromised" or false anchorage and a number of them, especially teacher trainees, are very suspicious of any effort to undo it.

Whatever the acceptance of anchorage information, and it is generally favorable among classroom learners, we simply go on to the next stage, which is the production of the anchorage. In English this offers us a number of

problems. Since the anchorage is up where it cannot be seen during speech and involves a portion of the tongue that is less sensitive to control, namely, the back, it becomes difficult to monitor and direct the efforts of the student to produce it in speech. As a consequence, strategies for the practice of English anchorage require extraordinary effort.

This is not the case for a language like Polish with its tongue-tip anchorage at the base of the front teeth, as has been noted. The tip is the most controllable part of the tongue, and the Polish anchorage is relatively simple to demonstrate, explain, and mimic. With a combination of anchorage knowledge, explanation, demonstration, modelling, and a text in phonetic transcription it is possible to get a group of students, as I have done for experimental purposes, to produce quite good Polish almost immediately. Some of the students, particularly females coming from languages having low anchorages, produce near-native mimicked speech in a matter of twenty minutes. This rapid facility with Polish is a function of anchorage accessibility. Japanese is another language with lower front tooth, tongue-tip anchorage which, it appears to me, would make its phonology likewise quite easy to learn.

To overcome problems in monitoring and training in English anchorage, we resort to its features of external settings, which receive so much attention in Honikman. Two notable features of English are lip spread and jaw set. These are not so pronounced in American as British English, but for training purposes we utilize extreme forms of these features to help set the anchorage. The relatively wide lip spread is a function of the musculature, which raises and holds the back of the tongue in the upper molar position. This is particularly true of the high back, tense, lip spread vowel /i/, which I regard as the keystone to English pronunciation.

The jaw must also be held quite rigid, for excessive movement in the jaw jeopardizes the upper anchorage, and it is the wagging jaw, which is the most notable sign of lack of proper anchorage or failure to achieve it among our learners. Jaw dropping and failure to lip stretch are marks of the students native anchorage at work and the accent in their speech will confirm it. To help establish English anchorage, which is a demanding physical process, I have students put their fist under the jaw firmly to keep the jaws and teeth locked together, with their lips spread as widely as possible and begin to practice with high lip spread vowels and preferably alveolar consonants, in such words as "seen," "teen," "neat," "bean," "keen," "mean," "lean," "seat," "leap," etc. During this practice very vigorous super articulation is required. The trainer and the trainee cannot "lazy mouth" or soft speak their way through exercises and hope to accomplish a change in anchorage.

The two stages briefly described above, finding the anchorage and setting the anchorage, can be presented in a relatively short period of time but would require periodic review. The crucial question is to find and practice strategies that will maintain the anchorage in connected speech

since the pronunciation of isolated words and phrases will not accomplish it. In fact, isolated phoneme, word, and other feature drills are dangerous and counterproductive since the student is likely to reset to his own anchorage at every stopping point due to the pull from his native anchorage. So there comes a time very shortly when the fist under the jaw or the fingers spreading the lips or other possible mechanical aids must give way to other strategies. The chief of these is what I call "nonstop" recitation or "non-stop" reading of sentences. The rationale follows.

If a language learner should attempt to read the target language very rapidly (you may try this yourself), you will note a peculiar phenomenon occurring. Depending on the accent level of the reader, the selection will be read with a series of stops, jerks, reformulations, surges, breakdowns, deletions, insertions of nonexistent words, skips, cut-offs, etc. The explanation for this is that, whatever the target anchorage assumed by the reader at onset, there is a quick breakdown under the stress of the task--the tongue is out of control, and periodic resetting of anchorage takes place. In other words, a cycle of breakdowns, resettings, and regressions to native anchorage is set in motion. The effect is like a wheel rolling on a flat tire, and it is painful to behold. Though the results are horrendous, this is exactly the place to begin the training for anchorage maintenance, that is, fast, noninternal stop reading or recitation of sentences. We argue that, to obtain a fast flow of phonemes in a language, the tongue must be in approximate anchorage position. Our students in our programs have a compromised English anchorage. They have a tire on the wheel but it is flat, so to speak. By resorting to the simple solution of forced rapid sentence rendition (read or recited) together with modelling deficient expressions by the teacher and, particularly, requiring repetition until sentences can be said without a break, we effectively force the anchorage up and make it stay up. Three things are essential: sentence length material, speed, and "repeat" until the sentence can be said without a break or phonemic error.

I have had the experience, while substituting for teachers, of observing students who (particularly women, who are more adept at phonological learning) progress from gross broken speech to beautiful English within a single class period. Of course, with only an hour of practice the regression is almost total. However, this is no great problem, for our students are with us a considerable period of time. The need for pronunciation improvement is so great for our students we should resolve that every teacher consciously work on being a pronunciation teacher. Under the maintenance program described above this is not a far-fetched idea and can be readily implemented. One cannot imagine the pleasure of teaching a class of students who have "made" the anchorage or at least made good progress with it --the free repartee, the level of interest, the quick response, the ease of speech, the grasp of idiom, etc.

Much depends upon teacher awareness. In our present period of humanistic/communicative approaches, ESL instruction is characterized by

teacher speech that is pleasant, soft, informal, understanding, friendly, accommodating, polite, urbane, well modulated, pleasantly toned, etc. The students' speech mirrors these qualities and, from a distance, the student appears relaxed and urbane, which, indeed, is an accomplishment. But listen closely and observe the terrible lacunae. This is reminiscent of the final prespeech stage of young children, who in the next room are carrying on a beautifully intoned monologue, but listen closely and discover it is made up completely of garble. Our students are still at the prefluency stage--nice manner, nice smile, nice echo, nice intonation but, unfortunately, tongue-tied. Our goals should not merely be the formation of "beautiful" speakers of English, which our foreign students are in their own right, but rather "beautiful speakers of beautiful English," for an accent is a rather bleak cloud to live under.

In conclusion we refer once again to the great mentor, Charles Fries, and his indomitable faith and dedication to the "oral approach" as the most efficient way to learn a language. While this intuition was not fully realized in his day, with new technology at our disposal, such as the nature of articulatory settings, we may approach closer to accomplishing his dream.

REFERENCES

Erazmus, Edward T. 1982. A new look at a cause of foreign accent. The American Language Journal. 1:57-70.

_____. 1981. Articulatory setting and language teaching. Papers of the Mid-America Linguistics Conference 1980, 137-144.

Honikman, Beatrice. 1964. Articulatory settings. In D. Abercrombie et al. (eds.) In honor of Daniel Jones. London: Longman.

Kelz, H. P. 1971. Articulatory basis and second language teaching. Phonetica 24:193-211.

Wadsworth, Stafford. 1979. Articulatory settings--the mechanics of variety. Revue de phonetique appliquee 52:255-69.

Wenk, Brian J. 1983. Articulatory setting and the acquisition of second language phonology. Revue de phonetique appliquee 65:51-65.